LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

In The

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 18 1971
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1970

No. 1004

Clifford F. Hansen, Petitioner,

vs

Ann Lamm Haagensen, Respondent,

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF IOWA

REPLY

Clifford F. Hansen
1040 Midland Bank Bldg
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Counsel Pro Se

Of Counsel
Hon. Harry H. Peterson
Minneapolis, Minnesota

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1970
No. 1004

Clifford F. Hansen,

Petitioner,

vs

Ann Lamm Haagensen,

Respondent.

REPLY
TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION
FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
SUPREME COURT OF IOWA

The questions of the jurisdiction of the Minnesota Court over the subject matter and the Defendant, (Respondent herein) have been fully covered in the Petition herein. See Petition, p. 12. The Answer of the Respondent herein makes no mention of the question of the personal appearance of Defendant (Respondent herein), in the Minnesota Court and the attack upon the powers of

said Minnesota Court. See Petitioner's Appendix, pages A-15; A-18; A-21; and A-23.

Respectfully submitted.

Clifford F. Hansen
Petitioner Pro Se

Of Counsel
Harry H. Peterson
Minneapolis, Minnesota

1-14-71

[redacted]

[redacted]

Clifford F. Hansen

Petitioner,

vs.

Ann Lewis Haugerud,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI
AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
SUPREME COURT OF IOWA

Clifford F. Hansen
1060 Midland Bank Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Counsel Pro Se

Of Counsel
Hon. Harry H. Peterson
Minneapolis, Minnesota



I N D E X

		Page
Introduction		1
Reasons:		
Par. I	Re: Applicable Constitutional and Federal Rules of Law	2
Par. II	Re: Applicable Minnesota Rules of Law, as connected with Par. I	2
Par. III	Re: Minnesota Rules of Law, as to subject matter jurisdiction, under Par. II	5
Par. IV	Re: Minnesota Rules of Law, as to personal jurisdiction, under Par. II	6
Par. V	Re: Minnesota Rules of Law, as to irrelevant matter, prejudicially adopted by Iowa Courts, under Par. II, III and IV	10
Conclusion		12
Attached: Certificate of Good Faith		

CITATIONS

	Page
U.S. CONSTITUTION & STATUTES	
Rule 58, U.S. S. Ct.	1
Art. IV	1, 2, 5
Art. VI	2
28 USC Ann #1257 (3)	2
28 USC Ann #1738	2
FEDERAL CASES	
Chicot Co. Dr. Dist. v Baxter 60 S Ct 317; 308 US 271	9
Grubb v Pub. Util. Comm. 50 S Ct 378; 281 US 470	9
Milliken v Meyers, 1941, 61 S Ct 61 S Ct 339, 311 US 457	2, 4
Wright v Nicholson (1890) S ct , 134 US 136	11
STATE CONSTUTION & RULES	
Minn. Const. Sec. #5	2, 5, 7
Minn. Rules of Civil Proc. 1958 Minn. Stat. Ann. V 27-A	2
Rule 4:04	7, 8
5:01	7,11
6:04	11
12	9
77:04	9,12
103:03	11
STATE CASES	
Burger v Berger, 1957 Tex 298 SW(2) 119	8
Clements v Utley 91 Minn 68 NW 188	7, 9
Cone v Hooper 18 Minn 531 (G476)	3
Cummiskey v Cummiskey (1961) 259 Minn. 427; 107 NW (2) 864	6, 9
Fred Miller Brewing Co. v Capital Ins Co. Ia ; 82 NW 1023 (1027)	3